



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

ENGINEERING FIELD ACTIVITY, WEST
NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND
900 COMMODORE DRIVE
SAN BRUNO, CALIFORNIA 94066-5006

IN REPLY REFER TO:

5090
Ser 10121/7088
8 July 1998

From: Commanding Officer, Engineering Field Activity West, Naval Facilities Engineering Command

To: Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Members Distribution List, Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord

Subj: RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD (RAB): MINUTES OF 18 JUNE 1998 RAB MEETING

Encls: (1) Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Draft Meeting Minutes -- Thursday, 18 June 1998
(2) Agenda for 16 July RAB Meeting

1. Draft minutes of the 18 June 1998 Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord, Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) meeting are forwarded as enclosure (1). Any corrections or clarifications to these minutes can be provided at the next RAB meeting, at which time the minutes will be finalized.

2. Enclosure (2) contains the agenda for the upcoming RAB meeting, which is scheduled for 7:00 p.m. on Thursday 16 July 1998 at the Clyde Community Center.

3. Please note the name change from Naval Weapons Station Concord to Weapons Support Facility (WPNSUPPFAC) Seal Beach, Detachment Concord. This new designation for the weapons station will appear in all future correspondence and documents.

4. If you have any questions regarding this correspondence, please contact Mr Steve Gallo, the RAB Community Co-chair, at (925) 427-3450; or Mr. Stan Heller, the WPNSUPPFAC Detachment Concord Co-chair, at (925) 246-5672.


WING WONG
By direction

Distribution:

Ms. Elizabeth Robinson Anello

Mr. Steven Bachofer

Mr. Scott Etzel

Mr. Steve Gallo

Mr. Edward Gardner

Ms. Susan Gladstone

Mr David Golick/Ms. Celeste Wixom

Mr. Stanley Heller

IR FILE

Ms. Dee Kilcoyne
Mr. David Kory
Ms. Sylvia Kotecki
Ms. Nicole Moutoux
Mr Marcus O'Connell
Mr. James Pinasco
Mr. Richard Purdue
Ms. Catie Roy
Mr. Roy Santana
Mr. Thomas Shirley
Mr. Larry Steinwandt
Mr. Gene Sylls

**DRAFT AGENDA
WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH, DETACHMENT CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

Thursday, July 16, 1998

**7:00 - 9:00 p.m.
Clyde Community Center
109 Wellington Road
Clyde, California**

-
- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 7:00 - 7:20 | Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-chair's Report, Approval of Restoration Advisory Board (RAB) Meeting Minutes, and Community Co-Chair Nominations - Steve Gallo, RAB Community Co-chair |
| 7:20 - 7:30 | Napalm Area Cleanup at Site 13 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Summary of Cleanup, Results, and Conclusions - John Bosche, Tetra Tech EM Inc. |
| 7:30 - 7:50 | Draft Site Investigation Work Plan, SWMUs 2,5,7,18, and Site 29 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• RAB Comments and Discussion - Steve Gallo/John Bosche |
| 7:50 - 8:00 | Confirmatory Groundwater Sampling at Site 17 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Results and Conclusions - John Bosche |
| 8:00 - 8:10 | Break |
| 8:10 - 8:50 | Draft Final Feasibility Study (FS), Tidal Area Landfill Site 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discussion on CAP selected in FS - John Bosche• Discussion of Navy Responses to Agency Comments - John Bosche/ Nicole Moutoux |
| 8:50 - 8:55 | Date and Agenda for Next Meeting - Steve Gallo |
| 8:55 - 9:00 | Public comment |
| 9:00 | Adjournment |

**WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH, DETACHMENT CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING**

DRAFT MEETING MINUTES

**Clyde Community Center 109 Wellington Road
Clyde, California**

Thursday, 18 June 1998

I. Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-Chair's Report, and Approval of Meeting Minutes

The former Naval Weapons Station Concord Restoration Advisory Board (RAB), renamed the Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord RAB, met on Thursday, 18 June, at the Clyde Community Center, Clyde, California. Steve Gallo, Community Co-Chair, welcomed guests and initiated introductions.

One responsibility of the RAB, Mr. Gallo emphasized, is interfacing with the community and bringing back advice on various environmental decisions and documents. Mr. Gallo mentioned he met with the Contra Costa County Hazardous Material Commission Planning and Policy Subcommittee who had an interest in Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord. He provided them with background information on the facility contained in a copy of the Installation Summary from the Department of The Navy Environmental Restoration Plan for Fiscal Years 1998-2002.

Mr. Gallo noted that since he has been Community Co-Chair for about a year, Co-Chair nominations will be accepted next month for elections in August. He encouraged RAB members to increase their efforts in recruiting new RAB members with special leadership qualities.

Mr. Heller mentioned that Mr. Gallo encountered a problem gaining access to the RAB file area in Building IA-2, Main Gate Building. Security, he added, has a binder with the word "RAB" on it that contains an updated list of RAB members that may access the building. He noted that RAB members experiencing access problems should request the duty officer to help with opening the building.

II. Presentation on the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Program

Mr. Gallo introduced Kevin Spinks, Engineering Field Activity West (EFA West), Installation Restoration Program Manager, to discuss Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) grants. Mr. Spinks noted that he provides oversight for open Naval facilities in Northern California and Nevada. The new TAPP program, he explained, began in February 1998 after receiving federal approval. TAPP funds provide RABs with an additional tool to help gain an understanding of the Installation Restoration Program process. He noted that copies of the TAPP Rule are available on the Internet and from Mr. Heller.

The Department of Defense (DoD), Mr. Spinks continued, has made funds accessible to enhance RAB participation and decision-making abilities. The program enables the RAB to fund an independent contractor to help gain a better understanding of their facility's cleanup efforts. Mr. Spinks announced that up to \$25,000 a year or 1% of the cost to complete cleanup (whichever is less) is available to each RAB with a ceiling of \$100,000 over the lifetime of the cleanup project. He emphasized that funds are withdrawn from money set aside for the facility's environmental cleanup budget; there is no separate funding for the TAPP program.

Eligible projects the funding may be used for include: 1) assistance with technical document reviews, 2) technical training, 3) review of restoration technologies, 4) participation in relative risk site evaluations, and/or 5) understanding health and environmental implications of sites and cleanup strategies.

Funds are not to be used for 1) additional sampling, 2) political activity, 3) community outreach, 4) litigation or legal action, and 5) reopening final DoD decisions. Community outreach mechanisms, he added, are available through a different source.

Mr. Spinks explained that planning ahead allows the RAB to use funds to their best advantage and maintain the integrity of the budget. In order to qualify for a TAPP grant, Mr. Spinks explained that RABs must: 1) demonstrate that technical expertise is not available from any existing source (i.e., the Navy, Navy contractors, or local universities) or 2) that the technical assistance is available, but the RAB would like an independent source of technical expertise. Mr. Spinks emphasized that RABs become eligible for funds if technical expertise is required.

Each RAB, Mr. Spinks continued, has the opportunity to select its own preferred, independent contractor. He informed the RAB of minimum qualifications the contractor must have which are: 1) demonstrated knowledge of hazardous or toxic waste issues and/or laws, 2) academic training in a relevant discipline, and 3) ability to translate technical information into understandable terms. Optional qualifications the RAB may require are: 1) experience working on hazardous or toxic waste problems, 2) experience in

making technical presentations, and 3) demonstrated writing skills. Mr. Spinks noted that the RAB may request these additional qualifications on the application.

After the *majority* of the RAB agrees it requires technical assistance on a specific project or report, then an application must be filled out; application forms were provided. Mr. Heller, Mr. Spinks explained, is the Navy's point of contact for TAPP assistance for this facility and is available to help fill out the application. Once the application is complete, Mr. Heller will submit it to the facility Commander for approval. The Commander may request revisions which will be discussed with Mr. Heller and the RAB's designated point of contact.

Once the installation commander approves the TAPP application, it is forwarded to EFA West who in turn issues a small purchase delivery order normally reserved for small businesses; EFA West is responsible for administration of the contract.

Mr. Spinks informed the RAB that once the funding is approved and the project progresses, DoD requires an annual report which is basically an update on the technical assistance. A final report is also required upon project completion, which is included in the facility's Annual Report to Congress. All information gathered from TAPP assistance must be made available to the public and kept in an information repository.

In summary, the application requires:

- 1) certification that the majority of the RAB approves of the TAPP project
- 2) a point of contact on the RAB
- 3) a project purpose and description
- 4) a statement of eligibility
- 5) the name of a proposed provider and alternate

Delays in TAPP funding may be experienced if the Installation Commander does not approve the project and the application requires revision. Another reason for delay may be that the Navy does not believe the independent contractor chosen by the RAB is acceptable. Again, Mr. Spinks noted that the Navy will work with the RAB to refine the requirements to meet the RAB's requests or develop another choice of contractors. Delays may also be encountered if the RAB doesn't agree on the project's scope of work or on the preferred provider.

Mr. Spinks explained that the TAPP Rule contains an appeals process if an application is denied or a contractor selection is in question. For open bases, appeals are first taken to the Installation Commander or Mr. Heller for a two week review. Appeals then proceed to Naval Sea Systems Command (potentially to be replaced by the Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific Fleet) for a 30-day review. The Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Environment & Safety) will issue the final ruling on the appeal after an additional 30-day review.

Mr. Spinks announced that applications may be submitted at any time, however that it is his hope that the RAB is receiving the help it requires from sources already available to Weapons Support Facility Seal Beach, Detachment Concord. He reiterated the main points of contact for the Navy are Mr. Heller, and Roy Santana, EFA West, however he is available to answer questions and can be reached at (650) 244-2669.

Stan Heller, Navy Co-Chair, asked whether TAPP funds are taken out of RAB funding or IR support funding. Mr. Spinks replied that TAPP grants come out of cleanup project funds. Mr. Spinks recalled that EFA West funded one Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) base TAPP project through environmental activity funds.

Edward Gardner asked which base had successfully obtained TAPP funding to which Mr. Spinks responded that he believed it was Mare Island (later determined to be Naval Air Station Alameda).

Mr. Gallo added that TAPP funds are easier to access than Technical Assistance Grants (TAGs), which are available through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S.EPA). TAGs, he stated, require forming a corporation in order to qualify for funding. He noted, however, that once TAGs were acquired, U.S.EPA offers more independence on how to spend the money.

Mr. Gallo acknowledged that the Navy has provided helpful speakers and assistance to the RAB, but noted that there may be some areas requiring additional understanding, such as acceptable results or ranges and supplemental background information.

Mr. Santana suggested that the RAB may consider seeking TAPP funds when a complex report is submitted for RAB review. He asked how long it takes to obtain funds for technical assistance to which Mr. Spinks responded that a typical time frame was between two and six weeks. Mr. Spinks indicated that, should the RAB decide to pursue TAPP funds, they should notify the Navy co-chair and EFA West well in advance so that proactive measures can be taken to ensure the application process moves smoothly and as quickly as possible..

If the RAB is interested in details of the contract acquisition process, Mr. Spinks offered another presentation from EFA West could be provided.

Mr. Gallo asked how the RAB goes about selecting a good contractor - one who would not present a conflict of interest. Mr. Spinks noted that Mr. Santana and Mr. Heller can suggest contractors, and he can also offer some assistance. He also noted that the Navy can share lists with BRAC bases, but assured him that specifying a contractor is not a requirement.

Mr. Gardner asked if individuals working for a major contractor could contract out independently. Mr. Spinks believed that would be all right, provided he or she meets the qualifications outlined in the final rule, and there are no conflicts of interest.

III. Presentation on the Tidal Area Groundwater Investigation

Rik Lantz, Tetra Tech Environmental Management, Inc. (TtEMI), introduced himself as one of the authors of the Tidal Area Groundwater Investigation Technical Memorandum Report. He noted that the last year of his 13 years of environmental experience has been spent working on Naval Weapons Station Concord.

In an effort to simplify his presentation, he explained that hydrogeology is based on two concepts: 1) water flows downhill and 2) it takes the path of least resistance. He noted these two concepts are manifested throughout the report.

He introduced the four sites with monitoring wells that comprise the Tidal Area:

- 1) The **Landfill Area**, operational between 1944 and 1979, is unlined and reported to contain old paint, solvents, pesticides, and construction debris.
- 2) The **R Disposal Area** is a large rectangular depression west of the landfill. The depression is surrounded on all sides by berms. Mr. Lantz noted the extreme western portion of the area appears to have been used for informal disposal of ammunition segregation debris. The buildings north of the area were once used to repackage ammunition, and it appears that wooden crates and wood packing material were deposited along the road on the west side of the depression.
- 3) The **Froid Taylor Road Site** is not documented as a disposal area, but Mr. Lantz reported that it has trash and debris lying on the ground. He noted that there was an unconfirmed report of a single piece of ordnance lying on the ground.
- 4) The **Wood Hogger Site** is where munition crates were chipped into pieces to sell to a plywood manufacturer. When the manufacturer no longer required the wood chips, the Navy disposed of the chips on the ground. Later a concern arose about whether the chipped wood was treated to protect against insects and mildew.

Mr. Lantz explained to the RAB that identifying the different types of geologic features in the Tidal Area helps the Navy understand the hydrogeology. The Tidal Area, he noted, is bordered by Suisun Bay and used to be inundated during high tides. Fill was historically deposited by the Navy to allow build out on the area. The pockets of fill material are a fairly heterogenous mixture of silt, clay, and gravel that sits on top of approximately 60 feet of Bay Mud. Bay Mud is comprised of silty clay that is comparatively impermeable to water and acts as a natural water barrier.

Mr. Lantz took note of a thick sand aquifer that exists below the Bay Mud. Since aquifers are used in some areas to supply residential drinking water, Mr. Lantz conferred with Contra Costa Water District who informed him that all their water is surface water supplied from the delta and that they currently use no groundwater for local water supply.

However, the Water District has installed four wells in the deep sand aquifer about a mile away from the Tidal Area near the Mallard Reservoir. The wells have a capacity of two million gallons of water per day, and may be used as a back-up water supply if the delta source should become unavailable. Mr. Lantz assured the RAB, since the wells are not currently used for water supply, are about a mile away from the landfill, and are separated vertically from the landfill by about 60 feet of impermeable Bay Mud, that they present no threat of exposure.

Another hydrogeologic concern that Mr. Lantz helped investigate was whether organisms in the Bay may be affected by contaminants in the Tidal Area. Mr. Lantz provided more details about the geology of the area to determine whether groundwater from the site actually flows into the Bay. Cross sections from the Wood Hogger Site to Suisun Bay and from the landfill to Suisun Bay were discussed in detail.

Mr. Lantz reported that the impermeable silty clay material that comprises the Bay Mud creates a barrier to water migrating from that site into the Bay. Although the geological cross section of the landfill contains sand lenses, fill areas, and peat moss, these relatively permeable units are not interconnected and do not present a continuous pathway for groundwater to migrate towards the Bay.

Mr. Lantz mentioned that he responded to a concern that filled portions of the slough may present a subsurface conduit for groundwater migration into the Bay. Soil borings were installed to search for coarse-grained material that could act as an underground conduit. Geologic investigation determined that portions of the slough are filled with clay and block water from flowing through preferential pathways into the Bay. Coarse-grained material was only found *above* the water table; therefore, groundwater does not appear to flow through the filled slough into Suisun Bay. A monitoring well in the area has detected no organic compounds, which confirms that water is not carrying organic material from the landfill.

Mr. Lantz informed the RAB of another interesting phenomenon discovered in the R Disposal Area. Investigation showed that water is flowing downhill into the low-lying (approximately three feet below sea level) depression, but water does not appear to be moving from this area into the Bay. Mr. Lantz surmised that an evaporation basin has been created, since the area is surrounded by berms. Within this basin, evapotranspiration by plants is coupled with natural evaporative processes and water is effectively transferred into the air. Mr. Lantz explained the analysis that confirm this concept.

The water table beneath the area was monitored by Mr. Lantz during both wet and dry seasonal extremes. During both extremes, analysis showed that the water flows radially towards the center of the low area. After periods of high water in the area, water evaporates leaving behind salt and minerals which are measured by analyzing for total dissolved solids (TDS). Results reflect a concentrating phenomena; the highest TDS measurement in the area is 65 grams/liter (g/L), which he compared to seawater which contains 35 g/L.

Mr. Lantz pointed out that all 23 groundwater monitoring wells in the area contain greater than 3 g/L TDS. The potable drinking water standard for TDS, according to the Regional Water Quality Control Board, is 3 g/L. He noted that the water would taste far too salty to drink, and in addition, would be very difficult to extract from the impermeable Bay Mud.

The 23 monitoring wells in the Tidal Area were installed in 1989, and four rounds of sampling occurred between 1990 and 1991. Metals were detected, according to Mr. Lantz, but no organic compounds that one would expect from the landfill area were detected. Normal laboratory contaminants were documented. No solvents or paint thinners were detected. In 1993, eight wells were resampled for organic compounds, and again, none were detected.

Mr. Lantz reported that four wells in the area were sampled in 1994 using low flow rate sampling, which was a new method to sample for metals in groundwater. He believed their results were inconclusive due to technical reasons.

In 1998, the Navy developed three objectives they wanted to address during the most recent groundwater sampling, which were:

- 1) to confirm existing information
- 2) to develop a list of monitoring parameters, since landfill closures require long term monitoring of over approximately 30 years
- 3) to test for radionuclides

Mr. Lantz noted that since cobalt was detected during the 1990 and 1991 sampling season, and because some isotopes of cobalt are radioactive, he resampled wells for cobalt to resolve whether or not radionuclides are present.

During the 1998 study, landfill wells were tested for a wide range of contaminants, such as herbicides, pesticides, volatile organics, semivolatile organics, metals, and isotopes. Other wells were sampled only for metals, TDS, total suspended solids, and isotopes. The 1998 results confirmed what was already known; there are still no organics in the groundwater (laboratory contaminants were noted). There were no unexpected radionuclides, but there were detections of ^{40}K and ^{137}Cs . Mr. Lantz reported that he found that ^{40}K occurs naturally in seawater. He added that due to nuclear testing, ^{137}Cs is found all over the world.

Concentrations of metals that Mr. Lantz found were compared to ambient water quality criteria formulated to protect ecological receptors. Mr. Lantz informed the RAB that by the time the groundwater reached the Bay where the fish live, it would be diluted, however the results were still compared to the ambient water quality criteria. He found that levels of arsenic, chromium, iron, nickel, and zinc exceeded the criteria. These random exceedances did not, however, indicate formation of a plume. A plume, he continued, is the result of a source of contamination. High contaminant concentrations would be expected near the source, and concentrations would taper off concentrically

further away from the source.

In summary, Mr. Lantz reiterated: 1) There is no indication of a plume, 2) water flows to the center of the Tidal Area; therefore nothing is migrating into Suisun Bay, 3) water contains some metals, but is too salty to drink and would be difficult to extract from the ground, 4) organics and radionuclides are of no concern, and 5) long term landfill monitoring of metals will help maintain the safety of the area.

Mr. Gallo asked what the source of cobalt was to which Mr. Lantz responded it only showed up once and might be attributed to a laboratory error.

Mr. Gallo and Stephen Bachofer questioned how plants in the low-lying depressions tolerate the excessive amounts of salinity. Mr. Lantz responded that pickleweed found in the area is known to be tolerant of high salt concentrations. Mr. Lantz responded to Mr. Heller's question about depth of the water table by noting that the water table fluctuates from close to the surface to a depth of three feet below the surface.

Mr. Gardner posed the question about whether surface water could have leached chemicals from the Wood Hogger area into the marsh. Mr. Lantz responded that four monitoring wells in the area have not shown any wood treatment chemicals such as pentachlorophenol or copper. Nicole Moutoux, U.S.EPA, noted that concentrations of wood preservatives were surprisingly low even on the Wood Hogger Site. Analysis appears to confirm the area was used for casual disposal of wood once used to pack munitions.

Mr. Gallo noted he was surprised to find that wood chips were 3 ½ feet deep at the Wood Hogger Site, and that soil concentrations of lead were as high as 728 mg/kg, and mercury 3000 mg/kg. It was noted that lead concentrations are a result of lead based paint, and lead is not that mobile. Ms. Moutoux responded that the only place being considered for a removal action is the Wood Hogger Site. She added that once more information is available on metal concentrations in the area, appropriate plans will be developed. Mr. Heller explained that possible action would consist of hot spot removal of soil, since there is no plume in the area.

Mr. Gallo asked whether there could have been a pre-existing source of contamination that caused the high metal concentrations. Mr. Bachofer recalled being briefed during a RAB presentation that there was once a smelter located in the parking area for the bunkers by Otter Slough. Mr. Lantz stated that the higher concentrations of metals in groundwater were not persistent over time and were randomly located, but was surprised to discover that there was once a smelter in the area.

While responding to questions about possible movement of higher concentrations of metals from the Tidal Area to Suisun Bay, Mr. Lantz noted that surface water flowing into

and out of the area flows through two apertures in Otter Sluice. Surface water in the vicinity of these apertures is being sampled as part of the ongoing monitoring, and results will show whether metals are being transferred into the Bay. Ms. Moutoux added that the Phase II Remedial Investigation will specifically analyze Otter Sluice. Mr. Gardner also mentioned that tide gates in the area have been inoperable. Mr. Lantz noted that they are not 100% effective at preventing the tide from washing into the Otter sluice, but they do allow water to flow quickly out into Suisun Bay.

Mr. Lantz invited guests to call him at (415) 222-8325 if they have any questions.

IV. Discussion Topics

A. Site 22 Groundwater Monitoring Remedial Investigation (RI) Addendum - Mr. Gallo explained that within the Inland Area, Site 22 contains a small building that was used for paint maintenance activities, and an underground fuel tank (adjacent to the building) that has since been removed. The RI Addendum proposes no further action, and Mr. Gallo noted that the RAB agrees that this is an appropriate action due to low contaminant concentrations.

Mr. Gallo did request an explanation for the estimated value of "J" in the qualifier column referenced in Appendix A. He asked whether it is proper to interpret this estimated value as being less than the practical quantitation limits of the test, but above the method detection limit. Ms. Moutoux and Mr. Santana agreed that adding an explanation would be helpful. It was concluded that the J value in the column represented a concentration that is below the laboratory's detection limits, so the laboratory cannot provide the exact concentration with 99% certainty. Mr. Santana noted that laboratories have quality assurance/quality control data validation processes. If they are unable to guarantee the accuracy of the result with 99% certainty, they indicate the results with a "J". He referred to 5 mg in the benzene column which represents half of the detection limit.

Mr. Gallo announced that additional RAB comments may be submitted to Mr. Santana until 22 June.

B. Tidal Area Groundwater Investigation Technical Memorandum Report - Mr. Gallo felt all his questions were adequately answered by Mr. Lantz during his presentation. He agreed that long term landfill monitoring was acceptable, as were other conclusions. Mr. Santana informed the RAB that the information gathered for this document will contribute to the next main document, the Draft Final Tidal Area Remedial Investigation.

V. Date, Agenda, and Location for Next Meeting

The next meeting will be held at the Clyde Community Center on 16 July 1998.

Possible future agenda topics include:

- Draft Site Investigation Work Plan for Solid Waste Management Units 2, 5, 7, 18, and Site 29
- Site 13 Napalm Area Soil Removal results
- Site 17 confirmatory groundwater sampling results
- Draft Final Landfill Feasibility Study; Ms. Moutoux suggested going over agency comments and the Navy's response.

VI. Open Discussion

The draft Site Investigation Work Plan for Solid Wasted Management Units 2, 5, 7, 18, and Site 29 was submitted for review on 8 May, but the RAB's copies were inadvertently addressed to the station. Those three copies were given to Mr. Gallo at today's meeting, and Mr. Santana requested that the RAB submit comments by the 10 July deadline stated in the forwarding letter.

Mr. Gardner asked if the Navy was developing plans on how to cap the landfill to which Mr. Santana responded that there are not yet any design plans.

A copy of these meeting minutes will be made available for public review at the Information Repository located at the Main Branch of the Contra Costa County Library in Pleasant Hill, CA.

ATTACHMENT A

**Agenda
NWS Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, June 18, 1997**

AGENDA
WEAPONS SUPPORT FACILITY SEAL BEACH, DETACHMENT CONCORD
RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

Thursday, June 18, 1998

7:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m.
Clyde Community Center
Clyde, CA

7:00 - 7:15	Welcome and Introductions, Community Co-chair's Report, and Approval of Meeting Minutes - Steve Gallo, RAB Community Co-Chair
7:15 - 7:50	Presentation on the Technical Assistance for Public Participation (TAPP) Program - Kevin Spinks, Engineering Field Activity West
7:50 - 8:00	Break
8:00 - 8:30	Presentation on the Tidal Area Groundwater Investigation - Rik Lantz, Tetra Tech EM Inc.
8:30 - 8:45	Discussion Topics - Steve Gallo (1) Site 22 Groundwater Monitoring Remedial Investigation Addendum, and (2) Tidal Area Groundwater Investigation Technical Memorandum Report
8:40 - 8:50	Date, Agenda, and Location for Next Meeting - Steve Gallo
8:50 - 9:00	Open Comment Period
9:00	Adjournment

ATTACHMENT B

**Attendance List
NWS Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting
Thursday, June 18, 1998**

**Naval Weapons Station, Concord
Restoration Advisory Board Meeting Attendance**

Date: 6-18-98

RAB MEMBER	Signature	Phone Number
Steven Bachofer here	<i>Steven Bachofer</i>	947-1453
Scott Etzel		
Steve Gallo <i>here</i>	<i>Steve Gallo</i>	965-370-7969
Edward Gardner	<i>Chuck Gardner</i>	686-1937
Dee Kilcoyne		
Sylvia Kotecki		
Richard Purdue		
Thomas Shirley		
Larry Steinwandt		
Gene Sylls		
Steve Volk		
<i>Rick Lantz</i>	<i>Rick Lantz</i>	415 222 8326
NAVY REPRESENTATIVES		
Clint Fisher (EFA West)		
Mary Gleason (Tetra Tech EM Inc.)		
Stan Heller (NWS Concord) <i>here</i>	<i>Stan Heller</i>	925-246-5672
Roy Santana (EFA West)	<i>Roy Santana</i>	650 244 2523
<i>KEVIN SPINCS (EFA WEST)</i>	<i>Kevin Spincs</i>	650/24-2667
REGULATORY AGENCIES		
Susan Gladstone (RWQCB)		
Nicole Moutoux (U.S. EPA)	<i>Nicole Moutoux</i>	415 744-2306
James Pinasco (DTSC)		
Lynn Suer (U.S. EPA)		

